



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,273	03/16/2001	Hiroyuki Nishii	Q63124	4971

7590 06/13/2005

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS
2100 pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

GARRETT, DAWN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1774

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/809,273

Applicant(s)

NISHII ET AL.

Examiner

Dawn Garrett

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 and 9-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 10 and 13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action is responsive to the amendment after final rejection dated May 27, 2005. The amendment has been entered and the finality of the last Office action is withdrawn. Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are cancelled. Claims 3, 6, 9, and 12 were amended. Claims 3-6 and 9-14 are pending and currently under consideration.
2. The rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamashita et al. (US 5,189,405) set forth in the last Office action (mailed March 30, 2005), paragraph 3, is withdrawn due to the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 and the amendment of claims 6 and 12.
3. Claims 4, 10, and 13 are allowed for the reasons previously given in the previous Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook (US 3,429,717). Cook describes a laminate film wrapper comprising two polymeric layers such as polymers of alpha olefins with a antioxidant layer in between the two polymer layers. A nylon may be further laminated to one of the polymeric layers (see col. 2, lines 7-26). The nylon reads upon the non-porous sheet. The polyolefin reads upon the porous sheet. The antioxidant is the

Art Unit: 1774

removing agent. The film is used as a wrap per the requirement of a container. The phrase “for an electroluminescent device” is considered to be an intended use and has not been given patentable weight. The antioxidant of the film absorbs oxygen. See entire patent.

6. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Farrell et al. (US 4,536,409). Farrell et al. discloses an oxygen scavenger multi-layered film for food or beverage containers (see col. 1, lines 6-22). The laminate sheets may comprise a polymer oxygen barrier layer per the non-porous layer, a polymer layer incorporating an oxygen scavenger per the removing agent and at least one polymer protective layer per the porous layer (see col. 10, claim 9). The polymeric protective layer may be a polyolefin (see col. 12, claims 25 and 26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3, 9, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook (US 3,429,717) in view of Biebuyck et al. (US 5,734,225). Cook describes a laminate film wrapper for a hermetically sealed package comprising two polymeric layers such as polymers of alpha olefins with a antioxidant layer in between the two polymer layers. A nylon may be further laminated to one of the polymeric layers (see col. 2, lines 7-26). The nylon reads upon the non-porous sheet. The polyolefin reads upon the porous sheet. The antioxidant is the removing agent. The film is used as a wrap per the requirement of a container. The antioxidant

Art Unit: 1774

of the film absorbs oxygen (see entire patent). Cook describes the packaging as being useful for hermetically sealing food, but fails to teach the packaging could be used to protect an organic electroluminescent device. Biebuyck et al. discuss the importance of protecting an organic electroluminescent device from oxidation by encapsulating the device (see col. 1, lines 7-37 and col. 2, lines 43-44) and further describes it is desirable to have a protective film directly adjacent the EL device (see col. 2, lines 53-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the film taught by Cook as part of a container for an organic electroluminescent device, because Cook teaches the film contains an antioxidant for protection against oxidation and Biebuyck et al. teaches organic electroluminescent devices need packaging in order to protect the devices from oxidation and subsequent limited lifetime of the device due to oxidation.

9. Claims 3, 9, 11, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farrell et al. (US 4,536,409) in view of Biebuyck et al. (US 5,734,225). Farrell et al. disclose an oxygen scavenger multi-layered film for food or beverage containers (see col. 1, lines 6-22). The laminate sheets may comprise a polymer oxygen barrier layer per the non-porous layer, a polymer layer incorporating an oxygen scavenger per the removing agent and at least one polymer protective layer per the porous layer (see col. 10, claim 9). The polymeric protective layer may be a polyolefin (see col. 12, claims 25 and 26). Farrell et al. describe the packaging as being useful for hermetically sealing food, but fails to teach the packaging could be used to protect an organic electroluminescent device. Biebuyck et al. discuss the importance of protecting an organic electroluminescent device from oxidation by encapsulating the device (see col. 1, lines 7-37 and col. 2, lines 43-44) and further describe it is desirable to have a protective

Art Unit: 1774

film directly adjacent the EL device (see col. 2, lines 53-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the film taught by Farrell et al. as part of a container for an organic electroluminescent device, because Farrell et al. teach the film contains an antioxidant for protection against oxidation and Biebuyck et al. teach organic electroluminescent devices need packaging in order to protect the devices from oxidation and subsequent limited lifetime of the device due to oxidation.

Response to Arguments


10. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dawn Garrett whose telephone number is (571)272-1523. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached at (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Dawn Garrett
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1774

D.G.
June 10, 2005